STANDARDS COORDINATING COMMITTEE (SCC) MINUTES

4 JUNE 1996

1.   *INTRODUCTION /OPENING REMARKS*

Colonel James Williams, Chairman, Standards Coordinating Committee (SCC), welcomed the members to the nineteenth meeting of the SCC. He thanked the SCC for a successful year since his tenure began. He suggested that the reason for the smaller attendance was due in part to competition with a simultaneous meeting of a Joint Technical Architecture (JTA) Conflict Resolution Group. A complete list of attendees is attached in Appendix A. He stated that the agenda was fairly short, but that there were several interesting topics that needed to be presented at this SCC meeting. Colonel Williams addressed the issue of the JTA for Systems Interoperability and then introduced Ms. Virginia Conway to present a Status Briefing on the JTA.

2.   *JOINT TECHNICAL ARCHITECTURE (JTA) UPDATE*

Ms. Virginia Conway briefed the status of the JTA from March of this year to present. She indicated that the General Officer Steering Group had been briefed on 4 April and that the JTA Working Group (JTAWG) held a Program Management (PM) Focus workshop on 11 April. The Working Group released Version .05 for comments on 15 March. This document was transmitted to SCC members via e-mail and posted on the Information Technology Standards Integrated Bulletin Board System (ITSI BBS). The JTAWG received over 500 comments regarding the JTA. On 29 April the Working Group released JTA Version. Defense Information Infrastructure Common Operating Environment (DII COE) issues were resolved, and the development of the JTA continues. A change page was posted on the World Wide Web (WWW) on 15 May. The comment period for this iteration of the JTA COE was extended until 29 May.

3.   *CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT OF THE JOINT TECHNICAL ARCHITECTURE*

Ms. Virginia Conway provided an overview of the proposed Configuration Management for the JTA. She stated the organization reflects the structure of the SCC. Technical effort within the JTA is handled by existing Standards Management Committees (SMCs). These include Information Transfer Standards, Information Processing Standards, Information Standards, Security Standards, Imagery Standards, and the Committee on Open Electronic Standards. The JTA Management Group (JTAMG) is a subset of the SCC and has the same membership as JTAWG. The Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) chairs the JTAMG. Issue resolution and approval is the responsibility of the SCC.

The Configuration Management process and schedule is presented in three phases. Phase I is the Scope Determination. It determines new domains to be added and overlaps with the

previous cycle. Phase II is a three tiered effort to determine the content of JTA Configuration Management.   SMCs take the lead and the JTAMG meets twice to coordinate the work. Phase III is for coordination and publication and is planned to require two months to finish. It consists of public comment and formal coordination. The JTAMG meets to resolve comments and the SCC will meet as necessary.

The ground rules are summarized as follows. JTAMG members (0-6/GM-15 level) represent domain interests for the JTA. The members provide feedback from users. They represent acquisition and development interests. Decisions are consensus based. There will be one major and one minor version produced per year. There is a recommendation to add the sustaining base for version 2.0. The intention is to get JTA started and then conduct configuration management as a normal document. Ms. Conway requested comments and feedback concerning JTA Configuration Management.

4.   *YEAR 2000 PROBLEM*

Ms. Von Bernewitz presented the Year 2000 Problem from a study conducted by MITRE. She discussed the situation in the context of previous hardware and software limitations. The problem is straightforward. The solution is more of a management than a technical issue. DOD must reevaluate their legacy systems. The legacy systems face one of three options: replacement, repair, or elimination. She presented the technical and business possibilities, including cost estimates for legacy system maintenance. This situation needs to be addressed immediately. Some applications are already failing. Most current systems will fail by 1999 if they are not corrected.

Ms. Von Bernewitz stated that MITRE had conducted a study and found that information systems cost about $1.02 per Source Line Of Code (SLOC) to find, fix, and test this problem. Weapon systems cost up to $8.52 per SLOC. They also stated that the date is found in about 1-5% of the code in DOD systems, but almost all systems are affected. The bottom line is that this is a software maintenance issue and it needs to be addressed as such. With cost estimates, figures reach up to $ 6 billion to fix this situation.

5.   *JOINT TACTICAL DATA LINK MANAGEMENT PLAN*

Dr. Charlie Dunham presented the Joint Tactical Data Link Management Plan. He stated his twofold purpose: present key elements for Joint Management of Tactical Data Links and inform the Standards Coordinating Committee of Management Plan status and outcomes. He shared the background information regarding the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence (ASD (C3I)) Tactical Data Link Policy of Oct 1994. This policy designates the U.S. agreed LINK-16 data link as the DOD primary tactical link for all services and Defense Agency Command and Control (C2), Intelligence. It reinforces the previous ASD (C3I) Common Data Link (CDL) policy. DISA was tasked to develop a management plan with the Joint Staff, Services, and Agencies. The plan's purpose is to enhance joint operational effectiveness.

In March 1995 the Deputy ASD (C3I) Tactical Data Link Working Group established the Management Plan Working Group with DISA as chair. The plan is periodically revised to reflect budget, requirements, and technology. In December 1991, the CDL policy mandated CDL for all Service Defense Agency imagery and signal intelligence collection systems. In December 1991, the DoD Fire Support Standard directed the Military Departments to work with JIEO to develop common digital standard based on Variable Message Format (VMF) (K-series messages). In September 1991, DODD 8320.1, DOD Data Administration, was established to manage, regulate, and standardize data. It established data models and a data element dictionary. This standardization is essential for joint systems integration and simulation.

The Military Communications-Electronics Board (MCEB) provides Services the requirement to implement. MCEB endorsement is sought prior to ASD(C3I) receipt. MCEB support will be solicited during the Budget 1997 and Program Objective Memorandum (POM) 1998.

The goal of the Joint Tactical Data Link Management Plan is to enhance operational effectiveness of Joint and Combined forces using standardized tactical Command, Control Communications, Computers, and Intelligence (C4I) data links in the battle space. The objective of the plan is to standardize C4I message and data element use to provide a seamless, flexible data link environment.

The objective pillars of the Management Plan are information exchange standards, technology media waveform, and Service migration plans. The Management Plan also focuses on data link message formats and data elements. It accommodates emerging technologies and best estimates of envisioned capabilities. The joint interoperability keys for the tactical data link are information exchange and system/waveform.

The joint information standard is based on the LINK-16 family of Tactical Data Information Links (TADILs). Maximum commonality occurs with LINK-16 ("J" messages) in the UHF L Band and Line of Sight. It includes Beyond Line of Sight and Digitized Battlefield requirements. It encompasses LINK-22 ("F" messages) in HF and Satellite Communications (SATCOM). VMF Links ("K" messages) are included for ground networks and combat net radios. The TADIL J family is LINK-16, LINK-22, and VMF data links sharing common messages and standard data elements.

Dr. Dunham stated that there is a need to quantify LINK-16 capability in the year 2005. The type and quantity of platforms requiring data links is a metric. There is need to examine Budget 1996 and Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP) for data link investment. Platform fielding is based on the 'baseline capability' of Budget 1996 plus FYDP. The 2002-2005 estimates will show the 'predominate capability'. The 2006 - 2015 best estimates give us our 'vision'.

The scope of the Management Plan indicates which links are included in the plan. These include AFAPD, IJMS, IVIS, LINK-22, MTS, VMF, IBS, TADIL J (LINK-16), TADIL A (LINK-11), TADIL C (LINK-4), and TACFIRE. ATDL-1, FAAD, GBDL, PADIL, TADIL

B, PLRS, EPLRS, and CEC are temporarily exempted until 1998. By January 1998, Services will demonstrate migration to J-Series family or resubmit exception request. LINK-22 and VMF are granted permanent exception. The tactical data links not "managed" by this plan include: character oriented/man-readable links; links solely for voice communications; links solely to guide/control weapons to target; links solely for testing, telemetry, and instrumentation; technology development links; and local area networks plus wide area networks. Oversight for the CDL remains with Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Organization (DARO).

The Tactical Data Link policy states that all legacy data links must migrate to the J-Series family unless granted an exemption. ASD (C3I) is the approval authority for all exemptions. All future data links/emerging technology must be 'adopted' into the J-Series family for joint use. This process is monitored through Mission Need Statement (MNS) and Operational Requirements Document (ORD) assessment in accordance with DODD 4630.5/CJCSI 6212.01A. The major key is the issue of enforceability.

ASD(C3I), with the Joint Staff, initiates periodic plan reviews and administers the exemption/ adoption process. ASD(C3I) convenes IPT addressing ground based tactical air defense data links. It convenes IPT addressing Internet Protocol (IP) routing to LINK-16 networks. The Joint Staff is the lead for identification of joint information exchange requirements (IERs). DISA ensures configuration management of data link standards. DISA provides standard data elements. The Services coordinate plan revisions with ASD (C3I), Joint Staff, and DISA.

In summary, the MCEB endorsed the Joint Tactical Data Link Management Plan and governing principles and agreed to support the management plan's objectives during Budget 1997 and POM 1998. The plan was ratified by all of the Services and participating Agencies and approved for use within DOD. Data Link policy was written into the JTA.

6. *STANDARD FOR RECORDS MANAGEMENT*

Mr. Bert Newlin introduced the DOD Records Management BPR Initiatives for 2003. On the technical side, the goal is to develop standard functional and automation system requirements, to incorporate records management requirements into an Automated Information System (AIS) development and redesign, and develop standard DOD requirements for voice and electronic mail records. The DOD management goal is to develop a standard DOD retention schedule, reduce the number of records retention periods, and migrate to a standard DOD coding scheme. There are three sections to the record management task force accomplishments. First, the DOD has created an automated document conversion that allows the ADC master plan to view the document conversion as an activity within the records management business process. The changing medium does not change the documents status, but it requires business need justification and responsible management of both the original and converted documents. Secondly, the DOD Management Task Force developed a comprehensive design for managing information as records. The functional baseline requirements for records were in the management application software and the certified records management product register. The application software standard was

developed as a result of the Oliver North situation. This standard prevents the destroying of records through the use of back-up tapes, thus ensuring that government records would be saved and easily obtainable. The ultimate goal was the Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) in the standard/industry standard. The last phase is records management for the electronic messaging environment. This provides interim policy for electronic records, including e-mail. The Defense Messaging System (DMS) US Supplement 1 to Allied Communication Publication 123 provides the standard. The certification test program was established to design a test of products to meet legal requirements by the government. This program outlines test programs, describes roles and responsibilities, and describes the certification criteria. The certifications are valid for two years or until there is a change in the standard, or in the Record Management Application (RMA) product. The baseline of these functional requirements is to identify records. The RMAs shall assign a unique computer-generated record identifier to each record, both electronic and non-electronic. The RMAs shall also assign a different record identifier to any new versions of a previously filed record. There are still many things that need to be done. The first is to continue to develop an RMA to meet evolving mission needs in a changing technological environment, to extend the RMA certification program to include a DMS interface, to incorporate the DOD records management strategy into other BPR efforts, to work with OMB, NARA, and other agencies to improve the management of information contained in records throughout the government; and to elevate DOD standards to the next higher level.

7.   *WARRIOR SYMBOLOGY UPDATE MIL-STD 2525 UPDATE*

CDR Wells presented the update for Warrior Symbology and Military Standard (MIL-STD) 2525. On 5 March, the frame shape issue was resolved at the SCC. All Services concurred with the proposal. On 24 April, the SSMC received the initial draft of MIL-STD-2525A. On 9 July, the final draft of the standard will be introduced for SD-1 coordination. CDR Wells stated that the anticipated date for MIL-STD-2525A publication is 30 October 1996.

He identified potential challenges for symbology standardization which include: incomplete symbol sets; incomplete hierarchies, equipment, and Combat Service Support (CSS); limited graphics support for rendering symbols and unanticipated issues arising from the SD-1. Future issues for this subject include: validation (operational) testing, establishment of an electronic database, incorporation of MC&G symbology addition of an intelligence annex, and the provision of one stop shopping for the Warrior.

LTC Roper then briefed on how funding for testing is a problem. He stated that the funding issue needs to be worked out between the Joint Staff and the Services. He requested the Services' assistance in that matter. He stated that an update briefing needed to be provided to the MCEB. The last briefing for the MCEB was in July of 1994; the next is being scheduled for August.

8.   *NATO INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM OFFICE (IPO)*

Mr. Lou Pilla presented the North Atlantic Treaty Organization NATO Post-2000 Tactical Area Communications (TACOMs) briefing. The objective of NATO Post-2000 (P2K) is to develop Standardization Agreements (STANAGs) to meet NATO P2K requirements. It addresses tactical architecture, eliminates the need for gateways between nations, and will help improve communications. The NATO P2K is a three phase process which includes: Phase 1, Review Technologies; Phase 2, Develop Tactical Architecture; and Phase 3, Form International Project Office (IPO) to develop STANAGs.

On 5 February 1996, DISA responded to an ASD(C3I) draft that did not support the IPO and recommended the use of existing mechanisms. On 13 February 1996 Mr. Emitt Paige signed a slightly modified version of the draft memo and distributed it to the MCEB principals. On 16 May 1996, a meeting of JIEO, US Army, US Navy, US Air Force, Joint Staff, and OASD(C3I) personnel addressed the Service positions relative to the ASD(C3I) 13 February 1996 Memo. The Service positions were: USN and USMC supported the IPO concept; USAF showed no firm commitment but was likely to support the IPO if the Army committed; USA didn't agree with the IPO concept but would reevaluate its position; and DISA would fund with USA and USAF commitment for a PM. Subsequent to that meeting the USA stated that it intends to support the IPO with PM. However, it requires guidance from the OASD (C3I) on the required functions, duties, grade and experience, and operating guidance for the PM. DISA will fund the IPO when the USA and the USAF commit to provide a PM.

Mr. Pilla then addressed the future events for P2K. The US's proposed modifications for the Memorandum of Understanding were rejected. If the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is not satisfactory, the US might not participate. MOU signature is scheduled for November 1996, and the IPO is planned to open in Paris in February 1997.

9.   *SISC UPDATE*

Mr. Lou Pilla presented a brief update on the Satellite Interoperability Standards Committee (SISC). SISC will have two complementary missions: DOD SATCOM standards development, preparation, and maintenance; and SATCOM waveform studies and analyses as required and tasked by DUSD/Space or ASD/C3I.   Charters are being drafted to describe the two missions, including the reporting chain. The goal is to align SISC with the NATO WG8 to ensure consistent US positions are presented to the international community. Three standing Working Groups for standards development are formed (EHF, SHF, & UHF). Mr Pilla indicated that the ASD (C3I) is still in the organizational process and there were two meetings in May to discuss the current situation. The standards will be reported to the SCC. He stated the SISC has had a lot of industry participation so far.

10.   *WWW UPDATE*

Mr. John Bridger presented a briefing on the ITSI modernization project. The basic guideline to this effort is to remove information from the TEAMate-based ITSI BBS and migrate to a WWW-based approach. There are three phases to this project. Phase I is to select, acquire, implement server software to transition the BBS content to the WWW.

Completion date is projected for 1 October 1996. Phase II is to offer limited Point to Point Protocol (PPP) Transmission Control Protocol TCP/Internet Protocol (IP) dial-in service until users complete the transition to the Internet/Non-Secure Information Processing Router Network (NIPRNet). This is set for completion by 1 April 1997.

Mr. Bridger stated that the ITSI Project (BBS, Web, Library) has been very successful.   The ITSI Web Service is heavily used and widely praised. The ITSI BBS has its drawbacks: it is difficult to find Web pages, training and support are labor intensive, proprietary interfaces, and small software vendor with small installed base. The WWW infrastructure is widespread, again making open software and access easily obtainable. The benefits of moving to the WWW are improved customer service, user friendly interface, more useful products (hypertext, graphics, etc.), improved control over the content of working groups and users, more responsive administration, cost effective, standards-based approach, reduced load on the Help Desk, reduced operational complexity, increased system reliability, reduced end-user training and support requirements, reduced administrative effort required for managing and maintaining the WWW site, improved administrative responsiveness, and improved performance measurements/statistics.

He then outlined the rules of engagement for converting the ITSI BBS: use existing ITSI BBS/WWW infrastructure to reduce problem areas; develop a pure Web-based approach; and incorporate proven, widely-used server application from an established vendor (or use public domain software). In addition, a minimum of the following basic services must be provided: Web access; mail server; anonymous File Transfer Protocol (FTP); security equal to or better than the existing ITSI BBS; support of the collaborative processes; support of the existing Center for Standards (CFS) Web CM process; and minimal impact on the users and staff.

Mr. Bridger identified the impacts to end users. They will have to become familiar with use of WWW applications and get access to the Internet/WWW. The CFS will provide dial-in PPP service and NIPRnet dial-in service to DOD users. The end users may need new passwords. He stated that BBS topic coordinators/webmasters will have to be trained in Web page development/management and will have to take an active role in managing their site. In addition, they will need to transition their existing BBS material to the Web. DISA/CFS will provide them the requisite training and transition assistance. Finally, he discussed the classified Central Database System (CDBS)/ITSI BBS transition: the Secure Internet Protocol Network (SIPRnet) connection is being acquired and installed; the conversion of the classified system to the WWW approach will follow the unclassified system by two months; the dial-in PPP via Secure Telephone Unit III (STU-III) will be provided; the SIPRnet dial-in via STU-III is available and, access to the classified and unclassified CDBS will remain essentially unchanged.

11.   *REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS*

COL Williams reviewed the list of Action Items from the previous meetings and

closed action items 1-96-02, 1-96-03, and 1-96-04. There were no new issues that arose from this meeting.

12.   *CLOSING REMARKS*

COL Williams thanked the briefers for their information updates. He felt that they were important issues for the SCC. He stated again the importance of the task facing the IT standards community working with CISA to complete development of the JTA. The next meeting of the SCC is scheduled for 10 September 1996. COL Williams bid farewell to Mr. Jim Seybold from the CIO who is going back to his parent organization and to Col Boles from DLA who is moving to a new assignment. In closing, he thanked all in attendance for their time and support and adjourned the meeting at 1520 hours.

APPENDIX A
STANDARDS COORDINATING COMMITTEE
ATTENDANCE ROSTER
4 JUNE 1996

Organization/Company Name	Member's Name
JIEO/CFS	Berrios, Mr. Will
OSD/C3I/Command & Control	Bennett, COL M.
USCENTCOM	Boatswain, MAJ N.
DLA	Boles, COL W.
DISA-CFS	Booker, Ms. A.
JIEO/CFS	Bragg, Mr. Norton
DCAA	Colison, Ms. J.
JIEO/CFS	Conway, Ms. Virginia L.
HQUSAF/SCTA	D. Omiccioli, Mr. E
DISA/CFCSE	Fagan, Mr. K
CIO	Goldsmith, Mr. R.
EUCOM	Gorzoch, Ms. D.
ASD/C3I/Communications	Grant, Mr. P.
HQDA	Hendrick, Mr. T
ACOM	Holroy, Mr. D
PACOM	Johnson, Mr. M.
CNO-N60	Jones, Mr. R
Joint Logistics Commanders C&E	Machado, Mr. J.
NRO	Meiers, Mr. E
DISA	Miller, Ms. K.
JITC	Neuendorf, COL J.
ASD/C3I/IT	Newlin, Mr. B.
NSA	Nunley, Dr. C.D.

Organization/Company Name	Member's Name
NORAD/USSPACE OAO Corp	Parry, Mr. C.
JIEO/CFS	Pilla, Mr. Lou
CECOM	Plant, Mr. J.
DISA/JIEO	Pulton, Mr. A
USSTRATCOM	Ramsey, Mr. L.
The Joint Staff	Roper, LTC N.
CIO	Seybold, Mr. Jim
NISMC	Vaughan, Mr. D.
DISA/CFCSE	VonBernewith
Chairman/SCC	Williams, COL James

APPENDIX B

STANDARDS COORDINATING COMMITTEE
AGENDA
4 June 1996

0800-0815 INTRODUCTION - COL James L. Williams

0815-0845 JTA UPDATE - Ms. Conway

0845-0915 DISCUSSION ON JTA CM PLAN - Ms. Conway

0915-0945 YEAR 2000 ISSUE - Dr. Engle

0945-1015 JOINT TACTICAL DATA LINK MANAGEMENT PLAN - Dr. Dunham

1015-1030 BREAK

1030-1100 STANDARD FOR RECORDS MANAGEMENT - Mr. Newlin

1100-1130 MILSTD 2525 UPDATE - LTC Roper

1130-1230 LUNCH

1230-1300 NATO IPO - Mr. Pilla

1300-1330 SISC UPDATE - Mr. Pilla

1330-1345 BREAK

1345-1415 WWW UPDATE - Mr. Bridger

1415-1430 IXMP CHARTER FOR RATIFICATION

1430-1445 ACTION ITEM REVIEW

1445-1500 CLOSING REMARKS

STANDARDS COORDINATING COMMITTEE
LIST OF ACTION ITEMS
4 JUNE 1996

Action Item #1-96-02   MIL-STD-2525 Symbology Frame Shape
Recommend Closure
The SCC agrees to the final decision of the MIL-STD-2525
Symbology Frame Shape issue, as written, unless the Air Force or
the Navy nonconcur within two weeks by March 19.

Action Item #1-96-03   Army and Air Force IPO positions
Recommend Closure
Army and Air Force are to share their positions with the SCC
regarding the IPO before the 10 April 1996 MCEB.

Action Item #1-96-04   DOD Representation to IT Standards Fora
Recommend Closure - CFS will take internally.
Develop a methodology for the review and consolidation of DOD
representation to IT standards fora.

Action Item #1-96-05   Feedback of DOD Representatives
Recommend Closure - CFS will take internally.
Address procedures for improving feedback of DOD
representatives to non-government standards fora into the IT
standards process.